App. F. IX 4

Previous References

192 ?.

File No. 283-28

Serial Nos. 1 10

Later References

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 10

Part B for [illegible]

SUBJECT

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

G. R. S. APP F.III—1] 1928.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Mysore)

NOTES.

File No. 283 28

FILE HEADING.

Management of the temple of Sri Anjaneya Swamy at Garagadakuppe, Tumkur Taluk, and its endowed inam villages of Garagadakuppe and Timmasandra.

FROM

Hanumanta Rao Son of Ramanna, Garagadakuppe.

No. Petition Dated 4. 2. 29. Received

Diary No. 1180	Enclos.	Spare copies	Serial No 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER. confirming the D C's order

Appeals against the M. C's order, directing the Continuance of the management by Supt. of the temple of Sri Anjaneya Swamy at Garagadakuppe, and its endowed villages, and prays that pending disposal of his appeal, an order may be issued directing the -

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Stay of the execution of the D. C's order.

1) The petition is duly stamped. The M. C's order is dated 4th Jany. 1929, while the appeal petition was received on 5. 2. 29. It is in time. From the M. C's

NOTES—First Sheet.

Serial No.

Order, it is seen that owing
mis-management of the So-called
Valinatdars, the m.c. has Cont.
The D.C.(J)^m under directing the Con
finance of the management of
The temple by Govt., and also
sanctioning a scheme of manag
ment etc.

2) Hanumanta Rao, has appea
against the foregoing order.
may at present with regard
be called for from the m...

3) The applt's request for a
Stay order, is for orders. n
Special grounds have been
urged in the petition justifying
The issue of such an orde
Submit.

4) A report will
be called for with regard
7.2.29. The vakil who presented the
appeal petition did not press for
a stay order, which need not
therefore be granted.

Submitted.) 7/2

5 A. MLS

9.2.29

7/2

NOTE—Contn. sheet

Serial No.

1 DR. Submit
AV
12.2.29

8 Jan
12/2

2 To Mem Coch
no 622 dy 6.2.29
Calls for certain records in connection with the petition

Counter petition (no 1506) from one H. Rama Rau protesting against the restoration of the management to the applt.

9 The receipt of the report with records called for on the subject, may be awaited. 10 Yes
11.4.29.
11/4

3 From, Mem no c.
Letter no 1383 dy 1.5.29.
Submits the report with records called for in Sl-2.

4 A printed copy of G.O. dy 2011 relating to the management of the said temple & its endowed villages, is in the records.
Mus. 7. no. 578-17 on the subject has been destroyed.

5 With a view to know the conditions of the main grant, a copy

NOTE—Contn. sheet

Serial No.

Calling for copies of the Inam registers pertaining to the Inam villages in question, is submitted for appl.

AN 16.5.29

13 Dom WD 18/5

4 T4/5 Lws

Do Hon Lieut-Col. Asst. Survey & Settlt. Offr. No. 2569 D/21-5-29

Requests him to send up for perusal copies of the detailed Inam Right Register of the villages of Garagadakuppe & Thimmasandra in Inam Portion of Kasba Hobli & Anjaneyaswamy temple of Garagadakuppe.

Sub(Dr.) Lws 23/5

5. From, the Inam Supdt, Letter no. 69 D/ 21-9-1929.

Submits Inam extracts called for in Sl. 4.

14 The facts of the case are given in detail in the Sub Divn Officer's Note D/ 12.6.29 contained in the Vern. Records

15 Sri Anjaneya Swamy temple at Garagadakuppe, Tumkur Taluq, is a Muzrai institution endowed with Inam lands Villages of Garagadakuppe and Timmasandra. It will be seen from the Inam registers that

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 01684—GPB—30,000—20-4-29

Serial No.

Lands were registered as Devadaya for the support of the temple. In Colmn 11, it is mentioned that under Sannad dy 21st Decr 1845, these villages were made over to Vakil Ramiah for the support of the said institution, and during the Inam Settlement, Rama Dasappa Son of Ramiah was in possession of these villages. (Vide Colmn 15)

X. Y

On account of past mismanagement the temple and its inam lands have continued under Govt management, and a scale of income and expr has been fixed.

16. The applt Mr Hanumantha Rau is the direct great grand-Son (by the eldest line) of the original Sanad Vakil Ramappa. His requests are (1) that the temple and its endowed villages be restored to him, together with the Sanbogi office, (2) that the Mantrapushpa and Bhatavrany Inam lands be enfranchised and confirmed to him, and (3) that the attachment of the Rajpal produce for 1921-2 of the said Bhat lands be raised, and the produce given over to him.

S(1) (Diary)

P

17 Mr. Hanumantha Rau appealed / The M.C. against the D.C.'s

WD 01684—GPB—30,000—20 4-29

Serial No.

declining to restore the management to him. The M. C. has ordered that the estate may continue under Govt. management, and that there was no sufficient reason for interference on his part.

18 Against the M.C's order, Mr H. Rao has appealed to Govt. praying for the restoration of the management. The grounds urged are the same as those advanced before the M.C. The petr. says that he has got original Records etc. in his possession, and that he was a minor till recently, and that he is not responsible for past mismanagement.

19 The case will be posted for hearing, if ordered.

Submitted

A.D. 2. A.D. calling for copies of G.O.s. as stated in the matter is submitted, as the said collections containing these orders, have been destroyed.

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 066—GPB—30,000—2647-29

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 28 of 192 8

Serial No.	
	Do
	The 4th Asstt. Collr. C
	Do No 792 dt 11-10-29
	Requesting to send up for reference copies of certain orders on the Sessl. collections
Sus (28) tlw 7/11/29	7 contg. the orders are not readily available
	From, the Asstt Collr Letter no 1383 dt 16-12-29
	Calls for the Vein records for Ref.
	22 Dft. Sending the records is submitted
	Ar 20/12/29
	23 Done
	tlw 20/12
	21/12
	To the Mag Conn
8	no 1312 dt 31-12-29.
	Returns the records requested in the letter under reply with the remarks.
Sus (28)	
	~~The facts of the case are as stated in the proceedings to the Mag. Conn. order appealed against.~~

Notices issued on 24/3/30 to appear on 25/4/30

Note—Contn. Sheet.

WD 066—GPB—30,000—26-7-29

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 283 of 1928

Serial No.

Letter No: C1383/28-29 dated 5/7/8

From the Mung: Commr in Myk

Forwards the Connected file of records containing the Copies of G.Os required for reference

24 The facts of the case are as stated in the preamble to the Mung: Comm's order appealed agst They are also briefly stated in paras 14 to 18 above All the relevant records have been flagged.

The case has been posted for hearing on ~~4-10-29~~ 8-10-29. One of the cases tagged with Mr Arulsami's appeal

Subd. in the Dy. Comrs office ~~Bangalore~~

16/4

Notice has been taken for the Hearing on appeal which was fixed for 8/4 but adjourned to the 16/4

The prayers of the appellant are:-

(1) Reversal of management of the Inam villages back to him as the direct descendant in the male line

(2) Reversal of two orders, which had been passed as gajanan Vrittis, which were ~~also~~ included in the Six Mantra pratipa

Note--Contn. Sheet

WD 066—GPB—30,000—26-7-29

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 283 of 1928.

Serial No.

and enfranchisement and confirm the q. them as personal inams.

3 His appt as Sthanbhogi and per her q. crops distrained

The management of the two villages were relinquished by the appellatives long before his birth in favour of his cousin Ramadas appa and for so much as 1879 and the Govt recognized the management by him as a Dharmadarsi in 1907

The two villages are known as dwadasa villages & the arrangement q. Vrittis made by Vakil Ramarao the Govt cannot be recognized as permanent arrangement, & it does not present Govt to make new suitable arrangements for the management of the institutions.

The 3rd request cannot be supported in the face q. facts disclosed re the management q. the institutions having been taken up by Govt

Ally 17/4

17/4

17/4

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—30,000—26-7-29

6384
21/4

Serial No.

This case was heard on 21-4-30. The appellant was represented by

Order.

31 The two Villages of Cramgadakuppe and Theimmasandra form the Devadaya Inam of Sri Anjaneyaswami temple in the former Village and there can be no hereditary claim to the Management of the temple or of its Inam lands either by the appellant or any other member of his family. Owing to long and persistent mismanagement of the institution and its Endowment the arrangement of allowing a member of Vaket Ramappa's family to look after them as the sole Dharmadarsi was terminated in 1918 and the Control over both taken over by Court. The direct Management assumed by Court is necessary in the interests of the institution. There are no reasons to interfere with the concurrent orders of the Dy and Mun Commrs refusing to grant the prayer of the appellant to entrust him with the management of the temple and its Inam lands to allow him to perform the duties of Shanbogue of the two Villages, & enfranchise the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—30,000—26-7-29

General and Revenue Secretariat. Mus File No. 283 of 1928

Serial No.

Mantrapushpa lands and to give him the Rajpal produce for 1921-22 of his Mantra pushpa lands The appeal is rejected

Mus
21/4/30

Subd with a draft for approval

Gs
26/4

3/

10.

Re Mg Con
No. 2257 § 29-4-30
Rejects the appeal as there are no reasons to interfere with the current orders of the C.D. 'I' no

Re N V Gramsevak
Ankola
No. 2258 29-4-30

Mus
2/5/30

NOTE—Contn. sheet.



F.C. 12866 24/4/29

5

D1180

Mur 283-28-1

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE BANGALORE.

Muzrai Appeal No. of 1928-29.

APPELLANT:- Hanumantha Rao, Age 26 years, Son of Ramanna, resides in Garugadakuppe Village, Hebbur Hobli, Tumkur Taluk.

"""""""

UNDER SECTION 21 OF THE MYSORE MUZRAI REGULATION.

The Appellant abovenamed respectfully begs to appeal against the Order of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore, in Muz. Appeal No.42 of 1927-28 on his file confirming the Order of the Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur dated 7th February 1928, regarding the management of Jodi Villages of Garugadakuppe and Thimmasandra and the disposal of the crop of the Inam lands and also regarding the Shanbhogie Office pertaining to the said villages, and the Appellant begs to submit the following GROUNDS OF OBJECTION to the Order appealed from:--

1. The

1. The Appellant is the great - grandson of the late Vakil Ramappa, who has done meritorious service to Government and to the Royal Family during the regime of His Late Highness Sree Krishnaraja Wodeyar Bahadur III. The Appellant is in possession of all the original records and certificates - granted to his illustrious ancestor by His Late Highness, and also by the various British Administrators of that time and the Sannad - granted by His Late Highness to the said Vakil Ramappa granting the Royal Protection to him and to his descendants for all time..

2. The said Vakil Ramappa built the Temple of Sree Anjaneyaswami at Garugadakuppe, and in 1815, His late Highness endowed the said Temple with two Jodi Villages of Garugadakuppe and Thimmasandra, and at the same time the management and the Shanbhoguy Office of - these villages were vested in the hands of the late Vakil Ramappa and his heirs.

3. That, on the death of Vakil Ramappa, the management and the Shanbhoguy Office of these villages passed into the hands of his grandson; and the Appellant's father Ramappa who was then a young and inexperienced man and one Pleader Ramadasappa who was the grandson - of Vakil Ramappa's younger brother Venkatarame

niah

Venkataramaniah is said to have been looking after the management and the Shanbhoguy Office of the said villages as a family arrangement and without prejudice to the claims of the direct heirs of the late Vakil Ramappa whenever they came forward to claim their rights.

4. That, after the death of the aforesaid Pleader Ramadasappa, his eldest son, Ramaswamiah, continued to manage the said villages, and the Shanbhoguy Office was being looked after by a Gumastha. The Appellant, who is the direct heir and the great grandson of the late Vakil Ramappa, is entitled to get the management of the said villages and the Shanbhoguy Office to himself and in his own right. But till recently he was a minor and the management of the villages and the Shanbhoguy Office continued as above in the hands of the said Ramaswamiah.

5. That, in the meanwhile, owing to the continued mismanagement of the said Ramaswamiah, the management of the said villages and the Shanbhoguy Office were finally taken away from him, and the villages were taken under the management of the Government and Dharmadarsies were appointed; but the Shanbhoguy duties were continued to be looked after by the Gumastha Byrappa as usual. But on a petition by the

said

said Ramaswamappa for a reconsideration of the Order of Government, the Government declined to reconsider their order; but were pleased to nominate him as one of the Dharmadarsies and a Convenor on a monthly pay of Rs.7/-. But, even then, the said Ramaswamiah, who is a permanent resident of Tumkur, - again failed to carry out his duties, and the affairs of tne villages fell into a chaotic - condition.

6. That, at the time the aforesaid - villages were granted to the Temple, the said Vakil Ramappa set apart two sets of Inam lands for the manager for the managership, and distributed four other sets of Inam lands to various Brahmins for Manthrapushpa Service. But by a mistake in the entries in the quit-rent - Register, all these six sets of Inam lands are shown as Manthrapushpa Inam lands. That this - is wrong can be easily verified by a reference to the old Tasdik Patti and Deed of Gift executed by Vakil Ramappa himself. Besides, it is clear that, as there are only four Vedas, only four sets of Manthrapushpa Inams could have been granted and the other two sets being set apart for the managership. Of these two latter sets of Bhattamanya lands, that is, the Sets of - Inams set apart for Managership, one set continues to be in the possession and enjoyment of - the Appellant as the direct descendant of the original Manager, Vakil Ramappa, the other set

was

was given over by Vakil Ramappa to his brother Venkataramaniah whose descendants are now in possession and enjoyment of the same. The Appellant has been getting his lands cultivated by his tenants.

7. That, as stated above, when the Government took over the management of the said villages and entrusted the same to the Revenue Authorities, the Revenue Authorities, on the ground that Manthrapushpa Services were not being performed, attached the Rajapal produce of all these six sets of Inam lands for the year 1921-22, and the produce has now been left with the ryots.

8. As submitted above, the Revenue Authorities had no right or justification to attach the crop of the lands which were in the possession of the Appellant, as they are not the lands given over for Manthrapushpa Services, but has been set apart for the Managership.

9. That the Appellant, ever since he attained majority, has been making repeated petitions to the Government to restore to him the management and the Shanbhoguy Office of the said villages; but his Applications have not received the gracious consideration of Government.

10. That, even when the question of removing the said Ramaswamiah from the managership

and

and taking over the management to Government, was being considered, the Appellant repeated his prayers and again when Ramaswamiah who had been reappointed as paid Manager was sought to be removed, the Appellant again submitted a petition to the Authorities urging his claims. - All the villagers of the said two villages en masse have supported the Appellant's claims - and have expressed their willingness to accept him as the Manager and their confidence in him. Both the Amildar and the Sub-Division Officer - have, in their lengthy reports, discussed the - Appellant's claims to get the management and the Shanbhoguy Office, and have strongly supported - the claims of the Appellant, and have recommended that they be given over to him as the great grandson of late Vakil Ramappa whose services to the State and to the Royal Family were so great and valuable, and to whom and to whose descendants permanent Royal protection was vouchsafed by His Late Highness. Besides his hereditary - rights, the Appellant is an educated man and has studied up to the Upper Secondary Examination - with English Language as his Second Language and has been in Government Service for eight years - and odd, and he is fairly conversant with all the duties that he might be called upon to discharge in case the Government are pleased to restore him to the management and to the Shanbhoguy Office - of the said villages.

11. However, the learned Deputy Commissioner

Commissioner of Tumkur, without assigning any valid reason, has rejected the recommendations of both the Amildar and the Sub-Division Officer, and has ignored the expressed wishes of the ryots of the said villages, and the hereditary claims and the qualifications of the Appellant, and has refused to restore the management and the Shanbhoguy Office to the Appellant on any terms. It is respectfully submitted that it is directly opposed to the Royal wishes and the protection vouchsafed by His late Highness Sree Krisnnaraja Wodeyar Bahadur III.

12. The learned Deputy Commissioner has further confirmed Byrappa, referred to above, as the Shanbhoguy Gumastha, though in view of the fact that he, along with Ramaswamiah, were responsible for the mismanagement, his learned predecessor, Mr. Mahomed Zahiruddin Mecci refused to reinstate him.

13. The learned Deputy Commissioner has further ordered that the attached produce of the Manthrapushpa Inam lands be sold and the proceeds credited to the Muzrai Fund. As respectfully submitted above, only four sets of Inam lands are Manthrapushpa Inam lands, and the other two sets are not Manthrapushpa lands, but were Bhattamanya lands set apart for the managership. As such, the orders of the learned Deputy Commissioner passed on the assumption

assumption that all these six sets of lands are Manthraphshpa lands, are errineous. Besides, the Appellant had no notice of Attachment.

14. The learned Deputy Commissioner - has failed to consider the claims of the Appella nt, and has not shown sufficient reasons to deprive him of his rights; and the learned Muzrai Commissioner has not considered the various grounds urged before him for vacating - the Order of the Deputy Commissioner.

15. The Orders of the Lower Courts are otherwise unjust and inequitable, and cause - considerable hardship and injury to the Appellant.

WHEREFORE, the Appellant most respectfully prays:--

(i) that the aforesaid two villages be restored and confirmed to him as Inam, and he be vested with the management and the Shanbhoguy Office absolutely, or, on such terms as the Government may deem fit and proper under the - aforesaid circumstanced;

(ii) that the Manthrapushpa and Bhattamanya Inam lands be enfranchised, and their possession confirmed to the respective holders thereof;

(iii) That

(iii) that the attachment of the Rajapal produce for 1921-22 of the said lands be raised, and the produce be directed to be given over to the Appellant and the other owners.

That, in so far as the Orders of the Deputy Commissioner are now sought to be executed, the Appellant will be seriously prejudiced, and considerable loss and irreparable injury will result to him of the orders of the Deputy Commissioner are executed pending the disposal of this Appeal before this Hon'ble Court. WHEREFORE, he further respectfully prays that, pending the disposal of this Appeal, this Hon'ble Court might be pleased to issue a STAY ORDER directing that the execution of the orders of the Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur be held in abeyance.

H. Hanumantha Rao

Bangalore,
4th Feby., 1929.

K.N. Srinivasan
ADVOCATE FOR APPELLANT.

FOUR ANNAS

Order of the Madras Commissioner in Mysore

Subject:- Appeal petition No: 42 / 27-28 dated 18th May 1928 of Hanumanthappa son of Ramanna of Gowdakuppe village, Hebbur Hobli Tumkur Taluk against the order of the Deputy Commissioner Tumkur District in the matter of the management of the Temple of Sri Anjaneya-swami at Paragadakuppe and of the Inam village of Paragadakuppe and Timmasandra endowed thereto

Facts of the case

The mismanagement of the Temple and the Inam lands endowed thereto was complained of by one Ramaiah on 4.2.26 at the time of Hebbur jatra and the appellant who was also one of the petitioners stated in his petition that the Inam village of Paragadakuppe and Thimmasandra in the Hebbur Hobli of the Tumkur Taluk [illegible]

Ramaswami temple at Gangapatnam, that the sole management of these villages and the temple was vested in one Vakil Ramanna under title deeds granted by H.H. the late Mummadi Krishnaraja Wadeyar and prayed that as he was the proper descendant of Vakil Ramanna, the management of the above villages and the temple may be restored to him. A report from the Assistant Inam Commissioner was called for on the above petition through the Sub-Divisional Officer. The records show that the mismanagement of the temple and its Inam villages has been the subject of correspondence from 1903 and even previous. In the Govt. order of 1903, Ramaswami father of Ramadas in whom the management vested till recently was allowed to continue as manager. But his mismanagement being found quite unsatisfactory the assumption by Govt. of the management of the Govt. villages was recommended by the Dy. Comr. in 1918, Govt. in their letter of 1918 ~~August 1925~~ August said that since, the control and

Supervision of the Institution already vested in Govt., no formal orders were necessary and that the Dy Comr may draw up a scheme of management and appoint Thodmadath Vittil Ramaswamiar as one of them. The Dy Comr thereupon ordered that Ramaswamiar may be employed as a paid agent, and that he should help in supervising the collection and performances of services in the temple, framing a scale therefor. On the sanctioned scale a pay of Rs 7/- was provided for the agent. Ramadoss Guru Ramadasappa was manager of the Institution on Rs 7/- a month. But his management also having been complained against by the villagers of Anekal and Kallerly during the Jamabandi of 1926-7 as stated above, the matter was enquired into. The appellant's petition to Govt to modify the arrangements ordered in 1918 was rejected on the ground that there were no sufficient reasons for the same: Later the villagers

recommended the case of the appointment
for the kind consideration of Govt. on the
score that Ramadas was residing at
Tirukkur and it was not therefore possible
for him to see to the proper discharge of services
in the temple and that Hanumantha was
equally well as better as he resided in the village.
The Amildar in pursuance of the wishes of the
villagers expressed in a mahazar recommended
the appellant being appointed as manager
as he was the nearest heir to the original
grantee being his descendant by the
eldest line and that the question of
entrusting him with the management of
village might be considered favorably in
case he showed good work as manager of the
temple. The 2nd Dy Collr supported the
Amildars proposal and stated that the
appellant may be appointed manager on Rs 10/-
the excess charge of Rs 3/- annually on Rs 36/-
a year being invested out of the savings in the
sanctioned scale (Jasmine 786-4-5, expenditure Rs 619-14-4).
On a perusal of the entire records, we
Dy Comr did not approve the proposal, observing

that the present mismanagement did not - -
permit the compliance with the request of the
appellant. The present appeal is against
this order. Ayah Ramabai also has
submitted a petition stating that even
long before the appellant was born, the
latter's father had relinquished by a
deed of 1879 in favour of his father Vakil
Ramadasappa (uncle's son of Ramappa)
the entire management of the temple and its
inam lands and the Shanbogi of the inam
villages and Ramappa's attempt to get
back his right during Sri P. N. Krishna
Murthi's time had failed and that there
was no need for a paid manager, as
there were dharmadarsis for the temple
and Shanbogi and patel for the inam
villages. The appellant's petition was heard.

143

Order no M. Dis J 28-29 dated

7th January 1929

Having regard to the

the Institution and the endowment attached thereto, this is not a matter which should be decided on any question of hereditary right or otherwise. The Commissioner has given cogent reasons for continuing the arrangement already made in the interest of the institution. Sufficient reason has not been shown for any — interference on my part. The appeal is rejected.

Sd) P. Sivaswamy
Asst-Commissioner

Copy applied for 7-1-28
copy ready 7-1-28
copy delivered 7-1-28
No. of words 819
Copying fees 1-2-0
Comparing fees 0-4-6
Compared by K. Sampangi Ramiah

"Copy"

M. Chennoji Rao
for Asst-Comr
12.

Before The Government of H.H
The Maharaja of Mysore ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ

1928 ನೇ Miscl App ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿಯು-ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಆಪೋನೆಂಟ್

H. Hanumantha Rao Vs. Government

ಮು|| ರಾ|| ಕೆ. ಯರ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್, ಎಂ. ಎ., ಎಲ್ಎಲ್. ಬಿ.,
ಮು|| ರಾ|| ಆರ್. ಶೇಷಾದ್ರಿ, ಬಿ. ಎ., ಎಲ್ಎಲ್. ಬಿ.,
ಮು|| ರಾ|| ಎಂ. ವಿ. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾನರಾವ್, ಬಿ. ಎ., ಬಿ. ಎಲ್., ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟರವರಿಗೆ

Appellant ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮಾ

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಜ್ಞೆರುವರಿವಿಗೂ ಕೊರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಿಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನ್ನ ಪರಇಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮನಡಿಸಿಹಣ ವಸೂಲುಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವು ದಕ್ಕೂ ರಾಜಿವಗೈರೆಪ್ಪೆಸಲ್ತ್ತಡಿಸತಕ್ಕೆ ಬಗ್ಯೂ,ನನಗೆಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿನೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ರೀಫಂಡು ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸುಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹತಮಗೆಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ತಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

H. Hanumantha Rao

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಖುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. KMS

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.
K.V. Srinivasan

ತಾರೀಖು 4/2/29.
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್ಸ್ for Appt

ಶ್ರೀ ನಂದೀಶ ಭಾರತಿ ವಿಲಾಸ ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ಜೆಕ್ಕಬೇಟೆ, ಬಿ. ಸಿಟ.

CT.....

.....

.....

Section Mu 2

File No. 783 25

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No. 1622

Three

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To ..... Mo. M. C. .....

Date of issue 16-2-29

Signed by Jm T-K-S Lq-r.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for report & his records, petition no 1180 29 4 22 from Hanumanta Rao Sa of Ramanna of Garagada Kuppe village, Tumkur taluq appealing against your order confirming the D. C's order directing the continuance of the management & sale, of the lands of Sri Anjaneya Swamy

over

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD0325—GPB—30,000—26 5-27

The place, and its endowed
main Villages - of Garagadakuppe
and Thumma Sandra.

Thanks

2 APR. 1929
No.

MUZRAI

D 1506

వెల్లుబాటులు పంపిణీదార శ్రీమతి ఎలిజా రాబర్ట్ చర్చిదారుకి

కొమ్మూరి కాలు మీద్దులు చంపిన ఇరు వర్గాలకు మధ్య కలహములు ఎలిజా రాబర్ట్ గారు

ఈ గ్రామస్థుల ప్రవర్తనంలో మీద్దు రాబర్ట్ చరిత్రంలో రాబర్ట్ గారు

అని.

మీద్దులు గ్రామములో వరద నీటిలో పిల్లలు కొట్టుకుపోతూ చేలుపరిచి ఈ

పల్లపుంతరాయులేదు ఇరు వర్గాలు మధ్య వరదనీటిలో ఈ గ్రామములో

లంజలేయుచున్నారు ఎలిజా రాబర్ట్ గారు వరదనీటిలో పిల్లలు

కొంతమంది ఇరు వర్గాలు మధ్య వరదనీటిలో ఈ గ్రామములో

ఈ పల్లపుంతరాయులు మధ్యవర్తుంతరములు ఎలిజా రాబర్ట్ గారు

రంజి రాబర్ట్ గారు 1879 లో ఈ ఇరు వర్గాలు మధ్య వరదనీటిలో

పిల్లలు వరదనీటిలో కొట్టుకుపోతూ వరదనీటిలో పిల్లలు కొట్టుకుపోతూ

వరదనీటిలో రాబర్ట్ గారు ఈ ఇరు వర్గాలు మధ్య వరదనీటిలో

క్రైస్తవ రాబర్ట్ గారు వరదనీటిలో పిల్లలు కొట్టుకుపోతూ

ఈ పల్లపుంతరాయులేదు ఇరు వర్గాలు మధ్య వరదనీటిలో

పిల్లలు కొట్టుకుపోతూ

ఈ గ్రామములో రాబర్ట్ గారు వరదనీటిలో పిల్లలు కొట్టుకుపోతూ

లంజలేయుచున్నారు ఎలిజా రాబర్ట్ గారు వరదనీటిలో పిల్లలు

కొట్టుకుపోతూ ఈ గ్రామములో వరదనీటిలో పిల్లలు కొట్టుకుపోతూ

ఈ గ్రామములో రాబర్ట్ గారు వరదనీటిలో పిల్లలు కొట్టుకుపోతూ

ఈ గ్రామములో రాబర్ట్ గారు వరదనీటిలో పిల్లలు కొట్టుకుపోతూ

ఆ నగరం చేసిందంటే కొల్లు మంత్రిత్వం ఉన్నారనే

ఉంటాడు ఉంటాడని చేసినట్లయితే వాళ్ళు వాళ్ళకి వాళ్ళకి వాళ్ళకి వాళ్ళకి వాళ్ళకి
వచ్చినంతదాంతుడు అతడిలో తిరిగినందుకే వచ్చినట్లు.

వాళ్ళందరినట్లయితే వాళ్ళకి ప్రయాణం చేసినట్లయితే వాళ్ళకి వాళ్ళకి వాళ్ళకి వాళ్ళకి
అవసరాన్నిని తిన్నవాళ్ళకంటే ఎవరన్నట్లయినా వాళ్ళకి వాళ్ళకి వాళ్ళకి వాళ్ళకి

29th march 1929

అవసరాన్ని అతడికి
మీకే. రాజులకు
ఇవ్వబడిన
ఆచార్యుడి శిష్యుడు

11 APR. 1927

No 1545

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT

MUZRAI

పై విషయ సంక్షిప్తవృత్త శ్రీమద్వేంకటాద్రిరాజవరప్రసాదస్థిరాస్తుకు

కొమ్మూరి కాలువ డిస్ట్రిబ్యూటరీ సంఖ్యలు చొంతి గరగదకువుపై వాలచ్చిన శివ్వమంత్ర

లూగ్రామనత్తు లిగ్రహరం అగ్రహారంలో శ్రీశ్రీ రాజరాజ కారణాలు 30-3-27

గల్లి పన్నెండవ్వ రాజ్యశిరుద రకరాలు అజ్ఞాయ వివరస్థలి

గరగదకువుపై మన్నవసంకరాయుడుగారు 5-2-29రల్లి గరగద

కువుపై గ్రామవ వర్షాగ్నేజోపేంట్లో కొలనకొండశిశిరకొండరువ్వకోండు పన్నెండవ్వ

దల్లి అభివృద్ధిలోకుతిలుక్కొన్నారి

లోభ వేంకటాద్రిరాజవరప్రసాదస్థిరాస్తుకు పన్నెండవ్వ రాజ్యశిరుద రాజ్యపట్టాభిషేక

పుత్రప్రాప్తి వివరంవియుగాంచి చొంతి గరగదకువుపై గ్రామవదల్లిలుగ శ్రీశ్రీ రంగ

నాయకు స్వామివారు దేవస్థానస్థిరాస్తుకు వర్షాగ్నేజోపేంటి మహోత్సవాలు చొంతి గరగద

కువుపై వాలచ్చిన శివ్వమంత్రగ్రామనత్తుగ్రల్లి గరకశిలాంతరు చరువవేంకటాద్రిరాజు

ధీర్ఘాది మన్నవసంకరాయుడు పెదరి రాజ్యపట్టాభిషేకవరవంశదవరాంశలూ

మాతంకిల్లువంతిలుక్కొలుగ శ్రీశ్రీ రంగనాయకులుంచువారు రాజ్యపట్టాభిషేకవరవంశదవరాంశలూ

పైగ్రహరం మాత్రం కొన్నగవంశదవరాంశలూ లుస్తారి

లూ మన్నవసంకరాయుడుగారికంటి రాజ్యపట్టాభిషేకులుంచువారు గ్రామనత్తుగ్రల్లి లు

వరుసక్రమంలో వేంకటరాజ్యపట్టాభిషేకులుంచువారికి వడిసిపుగకాలవల్లి ధిస్ట్రిబ్యూటరీ

శ్రీశ్రీ రాజవద్దంకం లుపరలనంతరం వేంకటరాజ్యపట్టాభిషేకులుంచువారు కారణ

కారణవరు పన్నెండవ్వ పుత్రప్రాప్తి యుంచువరకు శ్రీశ్రీ రంగనాయకులుంచువారు

రాజ్య లుపరువద్దంచారు ఇంచుమించు లాంప్రకార కారణకారణ వివరాలుచూచి

అప్రకార లువను పన్నెండవ్వ రాజ్యశిరుద రాజ్యపట్టాభిషేకులుంచువారు

లుకరకారణకారణంచే వేంకటరాజ్యపట్టాభిషేకులుంచువారు వంశదవరాంశలూ అదరవ

రాజ్యపట్టాభిషేకులుంచువారి ఈ పన్నెండవ్వ ప్రకార వడిసిపుగకాలవల్లి

రాజ్యపట్టాభిషేకులుంచువారు రాజ్యశిరుద రాజ్యపట్టాభిషేకులుంచువారు గ్రామనత్తుగ్రల్లి

రాజ్యపట్టాభిషేకులుంచువారు నైవేద్యలుంచుటలూ ఫుర్వారకు చొంతి వేంకటరాజ్యపట్టాభిషేకులుంచువారు

పలాలుపలాంచుటలూ కొన్నగవంశదవరాంశలూ లుస్తారి

ಉದಯ ಚಕ್ರವರ್ತಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಚಕ್ರವರ್ತಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ದಕ್ಷಿಣೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆ
ಯುವ ಜುಲೈ/ಕಾರ್ತಿಕ 26ರಲ್ಲು ಮಂತ್ರಿಯರಲ್ಲು ಬರದು ಕೊಂಟ್ಟು ಕೆಲವನ್ನು ಮಂ
ರುವನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಿಶ್ಚಯಿಸಿ ಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ

ಆಂಧ್ರಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಂದ ಉದಯಚಕ್ರವರ್ತಿಯವರು ಆಂಧ್ರಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆಂಧ್ರಾಮಾ
ವನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಸಮಾಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಕೆಲವು ಮಂತ್ರಿ
ಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದವರಿಗೆ ವಿಷಪ್ರಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದರೆಂಬ ಸಂಶಯದಿಂದ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಬಂ
ಧಿಸಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರಾದರೂ ಪಟ್ಟಿಜಿಲ್ಲಾಸಲನ್ನು $\frac{13}{14}$ - 5 - 87ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆ
ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಜಿಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕುಲಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕೆಲವರು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೀಗಿದ್ದರು
ಸನ್ 1927ನೇ ಆಗಿ ಜುಲೈ 15ನೇ ಕಾರ್ತಿಕ ಇನ್ನಿತ್ತು ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದೀಚೆಗೆ ಅವರು ಹಾಗೆ
ಇದ್ದಾರೆ

ಆಂಧ್ರಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಅರ ಅಜಾಪೈಲಿ ಕಾಲ್ಯ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾರ್ಕಾಪುರದವರು ಸಾಮ
ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಲಿಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯವರು ಸಾಂತಿಯಾಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದೂ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಲು ಸಾಂ
ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಪೇಜಂಟರನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದೂ, ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮಪ್ರಯೋಗ ದೃಷ್ಟಾಂತವನ್ನು
ಕಾಗಲು ಬೇಕೆಂದೂ, ಅವಶ್ಯಕ್ಕನುಗಿ ಸಾಂತಿಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಸಹಾಯದಿಂದ ಹಾಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ
ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮಾರ್ಕಾಪುರದವರು ಆಂಧ್ರಮಂತ್ರಿಯಾಗಿ ಪುಂಡಿಗಾಲ್ಕಾಂಡಲ್ಲಿ

ಆಂಧ್ರಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಲ್ಲರು ಅನುಭವಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ಸಂಕ್ಲಿಷ್ಟವನ್ನು
ಸಾಕಲು ಆಸ್ಥಾನಪಂಡಿತರಿಂಗೆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೌಢರಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಬಲರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ
ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಲ್ಯ ನರಸನದಳವಾಯಿಯವರಲ್ಲಿ ಲಿಂಜನ್ಲು ದೇವರ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ
ಸಂಕ್ಲಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿದಾಗ ಸನ್ 1871ನೇ ಇತ್ತು
ವರ 17ರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೌಢರಾಗಿದ್ದರು ಕೆಲವರಿಂದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಸಂಕ್ಲಿ
ಷ್ಟವಾದ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿದಾಗ ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿದವರು ಮಾತ್ರ ಉಳಿದಿದ್ದರು
ಆಗ್ಗೆ ಆಂಧ್ರಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದರೆಂದು ಸನ್ 1879ನೇ ಇತ್ತು
ಜುಲೈ/ಕಾರ್ತಿಕ 26ರಲ್ಲು ತಿರುಪತಿಯವರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದರು
ಸನ್ನದ್ಧವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತಿಕಾರವಾದ ಸನ್ನದ್ಧವನ್ನು (ಆಂಧ್ರವಾಸಿದ್ದರ
ನಾಕರಣವನ್ನು ಮಂತ್ರಿಯಿಟ್ಟಿಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸನ್ನದ್ಧವೆಂದೆ ಆಯಾಸಂಗಿ ನಡಿಯುತ್ತಾಬಂದಿದೆ
ಪುಂದ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಂಧ್ರಕಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಲ್ಲಿಜಮಾಲ್ಲು ಹೊಲಗ ನರಸನದಳವಾಯಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಂಧ್ರಕಲ್ಲಿ
ರಲ್ಲಿಗ ಆಂಧ್ರಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸನ್ನದ್ಧವೆಂದು ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಆಯಾಸಂಗಿ ಆ ಆಯಾ
ಪ್ರೌಢರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪಟ್ಟಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಂಟ್ಟಿರುವದು ಸನ್ನದ್ಧವಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಂಧ್ರ
ವದ್ದಂದಾ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಪಟ್ಟಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮೇಲೆ ತೆಂಪಡಿ ಸಾನ್ನಿಧ್ಯಾಂಗಿ ಕೊಂಡಿ
ಯಿಂದ್ರೆ(ನೆಂಬಿ) ಗ್ರಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಆಂಧ್ರ ಆಯಾಸಂಗಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಂಧ್ರಕಲ್ಲಿ

58 వరుద్ధవళ్ళ కళ్ళకి మంత్ర విముక్తిర నాకరిచే నేపుకరా చెప్పలుంచుకొను
వ్యక్తిగా మునకలిచేసి పోయాళ్ళు లుంచవలా కైకొన్నట్లుగా నేపుకరా చెప్పలు
లుంచువరకు చేసాక్షిగా వ్యక్తిగా మునకలి. దీనిక్షేదద నాకరమునేర 20-1-1903
నే రిజిస్ట్రేషన్లు దీనిక్షేదద్వ రుపలు రాశిలుంచుకొని దీనిపరమంత్రిపులు
కొన్ని చరిందుగా మాంచరిచ్చి అప్పిల్లోకరపన్నట్లు పోళ్ళచోకు ప్రకిరించినట్లుగా
పోళ్ళచోకు లుంచురాశి రిజిస్ట్రేషన్లు ఎరదిలుపరర దావులోకి కేసులుపెట్టుం
రిద్దేనే రాంపుద్ధకరులు ఎరుంచి.

ఈ నకరాలు మంత్రపుళ్ళన్నట్లుగా ప్రేనాంరచిక్కకొకరంచు కొనసా
గేరిందపరాంచుకొని మనుమంతరాంపురర అప్పిల్లాళ్ళ శిష్యులు మంత్రిపుళ్ళ
కొని ఈ ప్రచుపెట్టినట్లనే ఉంటాయో అట్లపోమంత్రిపుళ్ళకొని ఈ
చుట్టూ రిద్దేలు నాశి కోళ్ళ కొంపుళ్ళ కొట్టేసారు.

8th April 1929

అతిథి
శ్రీ. రామారావు
ఇంజనీరింగ్
ఆచార్యులు గారు.

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore,.....30th April..... 1929.

No. 1383 Qr 10 files 7/57
287

FROM

P. G. D'Souza, Esq., M.A., P.L.,
The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Muzrai 283 - 28 SECRETARIAT MUZRAI D.1665

To

P. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

FINANCIAL SECRETARY 1 MAY 1929

SIR,

Adverting to your letter No.1622/Muz.265-26-3 dated 16th February 1929 forwarding for report with records petition dated 4th February 1929 from Hanumanta Row, son of Ramanna of Garagadakuppe village ---- Tumkur Taluk, appealing against this office order confirming the Deputy Commissioner's order refusing the request of the petitioner to be given the management of the temple of Sri Anjaneyaswamy at the place, and of its endowed inam villages of Garagadakuppe and Thimmasandra, I have the honor to forward herewith the connected records received with the Tumkur District Deputy Commissioner's letter No.F.C.13066 M.3483 of 26-29 dated 24th April 1929 (copy of which is herein enclosed.)

This office file No.D$_1$ Dis.No.143 of 28-29 dated 7th January 1 containing the order appealed against, the preamble of which gives facts of the case is also enclosed for reference and hand set in.

The appeal petition together with its enclosures received with your letter under reference is also herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No.Rc.866 / 3453/28-29 dated 24th April 1929 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District to the Muzrai Commissioner in -- Mysore.

With reference to your Memo No.1383/28-29 dated the 30th February 1929, calling for the submission of the records connected with the ---- petition of Hanumantha Rao of Garugadakuppe village, Tumkur Taluk, ---- appealing to Government against your order confirming that of this offi directing the continuance of the management by Government of the temple of Sree Anjaneyaswami at the place and its endowed inam villages of -- Garugadakuppe and Thimmasandra, I have the honor to submit, herewith, the entire records on the subject and to state that the facts of the ca are fully set forth in this office files (R.Dis.2736/27-28 and D.Dis. No.2810/26-27) herein enclosed.

The appeal petition together with its enclosures is also herewith submitted.

"C o p y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

WD 0399—GPB—20,000—18-9-28

SUBJECT..... .....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section Inam

File No. 288 - 28

Serial No. 4

No.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

To

The Supdt., Rev. Survey

Date of issue 21/5

Signed by .....

Sir

I am directed to request that you will be so good as to send up for reference, copies of the Detailed Inam Registers pertaining to the Grant of the Villages of Garagadakuppe and Thimmasandra as Inam for the up-keep of Sri Anjaneya Swamy temple at Garagadakuppe in the Tumkur Taluk.

I have &c.

Encl. nil

Copied by 18/5

Examined by.....

over

WD 0399—GPB—20,000—18-9-28

Dy Sec'y to Govt

Office of the Superintendent,
Mysore Revenue Survey,

No. 69 Dated, Bangalore 20th September 1929.

From

D. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq.,
Superintendent
Revenue Survey Settlement
Mysore, Bangalore



To

P. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Financial Secretary to the Government of
H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore, BANGALORE.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 2539/Miz.283-28-4 dated 21-8-1929, I have the honor to forward herewith copies of Iram registers pertaining to the grant of Iram villages Seragadahalli and Hunasandra, in the Ami Amaneyavaru [illegible] of Seragadahalli, Kunigal Taluk.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

D Srinivasa Iyengar

BHK. SUPERINTENDENT.

Register of Inams in the village of

in th

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No. and name of field or fields comprised in the grant Dry, wet or garden	Extent Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas, and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Extent Measure in acres and their fractions in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
		Pymaishy of 1820.		
1	Devadaya	Area of the Village inclusive Inams		270.0
		Particulars.		Total area.
		Cultivated dry		158.07 =
		garden		.23 =
		Cultivable.		101.06 =
		Village Site, Malaya etc.		10.68 =
			Total	270.04
		The garden is irrigated by the Kapila wells.		

Sammat of in the Taluk of

		DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND	
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued If for lands, buildings, etc, whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, etc, or liable to quit-rent, cess, jodi, etc, amount of latter to be entered
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the ryots to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7			
6	7	8	9
		For the purpose of the temple which is said to be in good order and pooja performed.	Rs 19-14-7
	Belongs to Godeidar & Sirkar.		
42 06 —	16.01		
00.23 —	0.0		
101.06	"		
10.68.	"		
254.03	16.01		
ering Rupees 146-0-7			
200 for prospective in-			
provements. 3-15-5			
Total 150-0-0			
Accepted —			
Belongs as per Rajah's			
order 60-2-8.			
Deduct for lands			
Transferred for Sir			
ear Amani Tank.			
10-0-8.			
Balance. 50-2-0.			

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, etc., and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given
10	11
Mysore Maharaja 1815--	Mysore Maharaja's Sannd dated 21st December 1815 directg the Amildar to make over the villages of Timmasandra and Garagada Kuppay to Vakeel Ramiah, for the support of the Anjaneya Swamy's Temple & collect from him a Sum of Pons 14-5-0 on the above 2 villages as particularised in the Register of Garagadakuppay. Mysore Maharajah's order dated 2nd Mar 1816 directing the restoration of certain extent of land, which was in the enjoyment of Kere Lingaya, in the village of Timmasandra for the support of the above Temple.

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poonnah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
Anjaneya Swamy's Temple.		Jodi Account 1821 Bering. Pagodas 50-2-0. Deduct Jodi Inam 0-4-8 Balance 49-7-8 Anjaneya Devasm Jodi Account 1825 Anjaneya Swamy's Temple. — Do — Jodi Acct. 1830 — Do — — Do — Jodi Acct. 1831 — Do — — Do.

of the

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner. If the inam has been subdivided, the name, etc., of each sharer should be entered in the columns

Residence, name and age, etc.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Garagada Coopay. Anjaneya Swamy's Temple	"	"	"
The village is in the possession of Rama Doraiya son of Ramiah mentioned in the Rajah's orders.			

cont'n of col 17.

Annual collection.

	Land Revenue	Hobli tarfa
1860	79-9-1	3-00.
1861	86-12-11	3-00.
1862	84-4-1	3-00.
1863.	84-4-10	3-00.
1864.	75-13-8	3-00.
1865.	93-15-4	3-00.
1866.	86-3-5	3-00.
1867.	86-9-8	3-00.
1868.	86-13-7	3-00.
1869.	88-3-10	3-00.
	873-3-8	30-00.

903-3-8. average 90-5-2

Division

LENGTH OF POSSESSION

Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam Assistant's opinion and recommendation	Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissione
19	20

This is a valid grant and contains no boundary dispute. To be confirmed to the temple on the existing Jodi viz Rs 19-10-0 Quit rent as excluded from in case No. 3 Rupees 20/- avoiding fractions.

(Sd) B. Subba Rao
Asst.
10.8.70.

To be confirmed as recommended on a Jodi of Rs 20/- of which two annas are the Quitrent upon the Inam in case no. 3 of this register.

My remarks regarding the extra taxes, the right to purple, and exemption from the Inamdaran ces, made on the register of the Inam village of Garagada Kuttpay of this taluk belonging to this pagoda are also applicable to this village.

(Sd) B Gopalial
Spl. Assistant
24.1.71.

Show me remarks above alluded to on Inam village Garagada Kuttpa
(Sd) R H Cole
14.?.71.

Confirmed on Jodi

Boundaries.

East. Rayavara village boundary and Vamana Hudre Stone.
West - Cana company village boundary and Vamana Hudre Stone.
South - Garagada Coolpay -do- -do- -.
North - Cana company Inamdaran Kere Hallu and Stone

** (col 20) Why? not the Inamdaran parties. (Sd) R H. cole.

No, it is a minor GRB 1, 000 books or 2 sheets each—9 8 06 Inam. (Sd) B. G. Spl. Asst. 11.8.71.

I Concur. (Sd) R. H cole.

Godi @ Rs 20/-. including the Quitrent on minor Inams.

(Sd) R. A. Cole.
officiating Inam
20-3-71. Commissioner.

~~Vide also Govt. Progs. No. 1263~~
The holder of the village does not own a detailed Survey. See Anili Progs No. 131 dated 6th June 1873.

(Sd) J. Peckle.
28th July 1873.
Offg Supdt of Inam Settlement.

Vide also Govt progs No. 1263-72 Rev. 7.41-01 of the 16/20th Novr 1903 directing that the lands may be allowed to be in charge of the present Dharmadarsis.

(Sd) J. P. Grant
Superintendent
24.11.1903.

Copy

19-9-29. J. Annamanthadoo
for Superintendent of
Inam Settlements

Register Sheet No. 192

Jodi Gandgada Kappa.

Hebbar Sannar.

Kunigal Taluk.

Register of Inams in the village of

CLASS, EXTENT AND VA

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No and name of field or fields comprised in the grant Dry, wet or garden	Extent Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas, and annas, it is to be entered in this column		Extent Measure in acre and their fractio in decimals
1	2	3	4		5
		Pymaishi of 1870.			
	Devadaya	Area of the Village incl			
		Sive of Jari Inams etc.		330	
		Particulars		Belongs to Jodidar	Belo to Sire
	Cultivated Dry		221.62.	163.31	58.
		Wet	21.34	11.84	9.
	Cultivable Dry		4.32	4.32	
		Wet.	0.12	0.12	
	Village Site and Nalay-Kilkee		83.37	83.37	
			330.77	262.96	67.81
	The wet is irrigated by the Jodidar's Tank.				

ammat of in the Taluk of

		DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND	
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for tanks, buildings, etc., whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, etc., or liable to quit-rent, i. e., jodi, etc., amount of latter to be entered
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the raiyats to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7			
6	7	8	9
Being Rupees 178-2- add for prospective improvement. 21-10- Total Rs 200-0- Assessed		For the Support of the Temple, which is in good order and pooja performed.	Rs 22-1-4

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, all miscellaneou documents, and other proofs of long possession. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, etc., and the general specification terms of all documents produced should be given
10	11
Mysore Maharajah. 1815 --	Mysore Maharaja's Sanad dat 21st December 1815, directing Amildar to make over the villages of Garagada Ruppay Timmanandra to Ramiah Vakeel of the Palace, for the Poja of Anjaneyaswamy for six Bhattamanyand and collect from the Vakeel Pagod 14 5-0, being the balance of the of the 2 villages as per following Being of the 2 villages - 121-4-0. Particulars Dukkan - 21-3-7 Jari 7-6 8 For the temple 48-0-0 For 6 Bhattmanyans 24-0-0 Karekandi 6-0-0 Jodi 14-5-0. 121-4-15

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poorniah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
Anjaney a Devan and 6 Blank Mirasidars.	Jodi Accounts 1821. Anjaney a Devan Berij. pays. 61-2-7 Dedmet Lukam 11-3-7 Jodi Inam 1-2-0 Balance. 48-7-0. Jodi for 2 villages 14-5-0.	Anjaney a Devan Berij pays. 61-2-7 Dedmet Lukam. 11-3-7 Jodi Inam. 1-2-0 Balance. 48-7-0. Jodi for 2 villages. 14-5-0.
	Jodi Accounts 1825 — Do —	Jodi Accounts 1825 — Do —.
	Jodi Account of 1830-31 — do — do —	Jodi Account of 1830-31 — do — do —

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner. If the inam has been subdivided, the name, shares should be entered in the columns			
Residence, name and age, etc	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18

Garagada Company.

Anjaneyaswamy.

The Jodi village is in possession of Ramadasappa, son of Ramiah, quoted in the Raja's order.

Inams excluded from the assets of the village are registered on the reverse.

Subsequent alienation.

Basavanna Devaroo

Dry 0-3-4

Wet 0-7-13

Nerlandi

Dry 0-10-0.

Wet 0-10-0.

Annual collections:	Land Revenue	Hak
1860 —	81-9-2	1-0
— 61 —	88-12-8	1-0
— 62 —	86-9-2	1-0
— 63 —	86-9-11	1-0
— 64 —	91-13-8	1-0
— 65 —	93-11-4	3-0
— 66 —	86-7-8	3-0
— 67 —	84-9-8	5-0
— 68 —	84-12-7	5-0
— 69 —	86-7-1	5-0
	877-7-8	26-0

= 903-7-8

Average Rs 90-5-7

Division

LENGTH OF POSSESSION

Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam. Assistant's opinion and recommendation.	Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner
19	20
The grant of this village being a valid one I recommend that it may be confirmed on the existing Jodi viz Rs — 22-4-0 Quitrent on Excluded Inam case No. 3 — — 0-4-0 — — — 22-8-0 (Sd) K. Subba Rao Asstt. 10.8.70.	To be confirmed as recommended on the existing Jodi of Rs 22-8-0 avoiding fractions and including the Quitrent upon case No. 3. It is presumed that the village is within the resurveyed limits and the Inamdars statement was attested by the adjoining villagers. The Mohatarfa is as usual left to the Inamdars, the Bayer and Aleksari are resumed. The right to forests is subjected to the reservation in Chief Commissioner's forest notification of June 1869. The village is exempted from the operation of the irrigation cess. (Sd) B. Gopalan S/C. Assistant 24-1-71.
Boundary — . East — By the Rayanda village Boundary and Vanana Hudde Stone. South — By Bisalkadi Boundary and do Stone. West — Amritmahal Kesval bonds. North — by Thimmanna Sanoora Village boundaries and Vanana Hudde Stone	Confirmed Subject etc.

is a quitrent of Rs 22-8-0 including the Quit rent on minor Inams.

(Sd). T. Clerk.

Inam Commissioner

February 17. 1871.

The holder of the village does not desire a detailed survey. Vide Bailiff Ukzee No. 131/5 of the 6th June 73.

(Sd) J. Pickle

28.7.73.

Vide also Govt. Pro. No. 1263-72 Rev. J. 41-01 of the 16/20 November 1903 directing the lands to be in charge of the present Dharmadarsis.

(Sd) J. P. Grant

24.11.1903. Superintendent

Copy

T Ramanathan

for Superintendent of Revenue Survey and Inam Settlement

11.9.29.

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT

Section Mlg

File No. 283 8

Serial No. 6

No. 7928 11

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To

.....Hon Mr.....

Date of issue.....11/10/28.....

Dear Mr Navaratnasingha

Signed by.....

Adverting to your letter No. 1383 Dy 1st May 1929 Reporting on the appeal petition from Hanumanta Rau praying for the registration of the management of Sri Anjaneya Swamy temple at Gangadarappa Village, Tumkur Taluk I am directed to request you to send up for reference the original

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

to in the Very records
Connected with the Case,
as the Seeli Cancelling
Containing the orders
are, not readily available
(2) the records ~~are~~ ~~not~~.
~~for~~ ref ~~to~~ ~~such~~
~~I have the~~
Yours Sincerely
W
5/10
Duly Dis Seeli 5/10
Lws

16 DEC.

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore. 14th December 1929.

No. 1383-Rev 78-9

FROM

Rajakaryapravina
P. G. D'Souza, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.



To

Rajasevaparayana
B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

SIR,

With reference to D.O. letter No.792/Muz.283-28 dated the 7th October 1929 from the Assistant Secretary requesting to send up certain references referred to in the vernacular records connected with the appeal petition of Hanumantha Rao praying for the restoration of the management of Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Garagadakuppe village in the Tumkur Taluk, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of letter No.1170/29-30 dated the 4th December 1929 from the Deputy Commissioner Tumkur District and to request that the vernacular files required by the Deputy Commissioner may be kindly sent early for transmission to him.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Ra Narasimha Ayyangar
for Assistant commissioner
Muzrai Commissioner.
(Absent from station)

Letter No.M.1170/29-30 dated 4th December 1929 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Referring to your Memo No.1383/28-29 dated 21st October 1929, calling for the submission of the copies of orders referred to in the Financial Secretary's D.O. letter No.792 Muz.283-28 dated 7-10-1929, and connected with the management of Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at -- Garagadakuppe village, Tumkur Taluk, I have the honor to state that the Higher Current Register of this office do not show that the said orders were received here. I request you therefore to kindly send the vernacular files sent with this office No.2453/28-29 dated 24th April 1929, so as to enable me to find out the original entry against which the said orders might have been noted.

"C o p y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

Section J 11

File No.

Serial No.

No. 1312/10 Kris

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To

.....Mrs. Tas. S.....

Date of issue.....31-12-79.....

Signed by.....M.T.K.S. Das.....

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

21/12

Examined by.....

Sri,

As requested in your letter no. 1383 Dy 16th Dec. 79 I am directed to return herewith the memo. connected with the management of Sri Anjaneya Swamy temple at Gnadasakeppa Village, Hunsur Taluk, and to request that the reqs. called for in this office letter no. 1921 already sent 282 28 1 Dy 11.12.79 may kindly be furnished

over

మంత్రిగారుసంస్థానదివ్రాణముమహారాజాశ్రీకారదముఖ

రాయోప్రోగ్రోప్రోఅయ్యామెంబరవరరుజూరుముహా
సన్నిధానంగళకు

తమమూరుతాల్లూకుచిబ్బారుగుమ్మళుజోగిసరుగదకుర్చివేటిగ్రామచిల్లరు
రామకృష్ణవరమగహనుమంతరాయసలనంతవిజ్ఞాపనెగళు.

(1) తమమూరుతాల్లూకుచిబ్బారుసమీపదజోగిసరుగదకుర్చివేటి
గ్రామగళమ్యానేజుమెంటుతప్పిహోగిరువుదరింద నానుమైసూరిగె విచారణె
గాగిబరలిక్కాగి 4-2-1929రల్లిసన్నిధానదల్లిక్రమవాగిలంచీలుమాడికొండ్రు
క్కిరకుల్పతిసిసూ యావజ్జీవర్ధమూ లభించదాగిల్ల ముహాజ్ఞామి.

(2) ఫసలినమన్నుకొండిదమహాప్రభుగళు సంతోషనలరు వాలు
న్నుశిక్షక్షతేందు కొండు అళదమహాజ్ఞామి శ్రీకృష్ణరాజవడయరవ
రవాగ్దానగళన్నుజ్ఞాపకొండ్ద్వారమూ డువ్వదర మూల్యలంచీలుఆజ్ఞ
యల్లివిజ్ఞాపిసికొండిరతక్క లంశగళన్నుపరిశీలిసి న్యాయవాద
తక్కదారనాదనసనేమేల్మండువనాంగ్రామగళమ్యానేజ్‌మెంట్‌మా
డ్వకాగి మనుష్యవిరుద్ధన్నువయకాంతని దాక్షిణ్యజోడాగి ప్రార్థిసి
కుకైదనే

మహాజ్ఞామి.

I beg to remain sir
your most obedient servant
H Hanumantharao
Garugadakuppy

10-1-1930

Copies of certain orders have been called for from the Mys Court (792 & 11-10-29) their receipt awaited. Submitted

Inform the applicant that the matter is under consideration

RS 31/1/30. (Secy.) 31/1/30 31/1/30 DR 3.2.1930.

Nirmalkar Card no 1611

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore.....5th March.....19 29

No. C 1383/28-29
one of 10 files
(This office file No. D1 Dis 143/29)

FROM

Rajakaryapravina

P. G. D'SOUZA, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

1145 0

Mar 2 8 - 29 -

To

Rajasevaparayana
B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., P.A., P.L.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Financial Department.

SIR,

With reference to your D.O. letter No.792 Muz.283-28 dated 7th 11th October 1929 requesting to send up for reference copies of the marginally noted orders re the appeal petition of one Hanumantha Rao praying for the restoration of the management Sri Anjaneyaswami Temple at Garagadakuppe Village, Tumkur Taluk, I have the honor to forward herewith the connected file of records endi with the Tumkur Deputy Commissioner's letter No.M-2453-28-29 dated 25 25-2-30 and to state that the copies of the required orders are conta ne in the records and are flagged A. P. C. The file may kindly be returned when done with.

(1) Letter No.539/573-17-2 dated 16 - 8 -1918.
(2) No.490/Muz.801-19-6 " 7 - 8 -1920.
(3) Endorsement No.1868 " 18 -12 -1919.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

For Muzrai Commissioner,

A.A.M.

M-2453-28-29

Encl 10 files

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
TUMKUR DISTRICT.

Dated, Tumkur, 25th February 1930

From

G. B. HEBLIKAR, Esq., B.A., LL.B.,
Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District,
Tumkur.

C 1380/29

Rec'd FEB 28 1930

To Rajakarya-Pravina,
P.G.D'Souza, Esqr:, B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 1380/29-30 dated 13th January 1930, returning the records sent with this office letter No. 2453/28-29 dated 24-4-1929 and requesting to send the copies of certain orders required by the Financial Secretary in connection with the restoration of the management of Sree Anjaneya-swami temple at Garugadakuppe village, in the Tumkur Taluk, I have the honor to state that the copies of the three orders referred to in the Financial Secretary's letter No. 792/Muz. 283-28 dated 7-10-1929 are contained in the vernacular files submitted to your office and they are flagged A.B.& C.

The entire records received with your letter under reply are herewith resubmitted.

I have the honor to be,
sir,
Your most obedient servant,

For Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District.

25/2/30

AF.25/2

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No, _____
No

Enclosure No. 3

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Muz Appeal No. 26. of 1929-30.

Appellant.

~~Appellant~~ ~~Vs~~ ~~Respondent~~

Mr Hanumantha Rao. Son of Ramanna.
Garagadakuppe Village. Hebbur Hobli.
Tumkur Taluk.

Subject.

~~Appeals~~ against the Muz. Comm^r's order rejecting the appeal against ~~Confirming~~ the order passed by the Dc Tumkur in regard to the management of the Sri Anjaneya Swamy temples at Garagadakuppe and the inam villages endowed thereto.

The Case was heard on 21.4.30. The appellant was represented by Mr M. V. Srinivasa Rao B.A, B.L.

Order

Here type Member's minute in para 31 of the rules.

Bd/-
for H Secy

Memo: No: 2257/Records dated. 29/4/30

Muz 283 28-10. Copy to the Dc. for information.

GPB—1000—8 8 11

Received herewith this letter no: C 1383/28-29

Dated 5.3.30.

Bro.

28/2/30

for Hy. Secy:

GS 24/4.

Memo: No: 2258 Dated 29.4.30

Copy to the Advocate (Mr. M.V. Seshachari

for information.

Bro.

for Hy. Secy

GS 24/4

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Muzrai Appeal No. **26** of **1929-30**

Appellant.

Mr. Hanumantha Rao son of Ramanna, Garagadakuppe village, Hebbur Hobli, Tumkur Taluk.

Subject.

Appeals against the Muzrai Commissioner's order rejecting the appeal against the order passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur in regard to the management of the Sri Anjaneyaswamy temple at Garagadakuppe and the Inam villages endowed thereto.

The case was heard on 21st April 1930. The appellant was represented by Mr. L.V. Srinivasa Rao, B.A., B.L.

O r d e r .

The two villages of Garugadakuppe and Thimmasandra form the Devadaya Inam of Sri Anjaneyaswami temple in the former village and there can be no hereditary claim to the management of the temple or of its Inam lands either by the Appellant or any other member of his family. Owing to long and persistent mismanagement of the institution and its endowment the arrangement of allowing a member of Vakil Ramappa's family to look after them as the sole Dharmadarsi was terminated in 1918 and the control over both taken over by Government. The direct management assumed by Government is necessary in the interests of the institution

GPB-500-28 8-16

institution. There are no reasons to interfere with the current orders of the Deputy Commissioner and Huzrai Commissioner refusing to grant the prayer of the appellant to entrust him with the management of the temple and its Inam lands, to allow him to perform the duties of Shanbogue of the two villages, to enfranchise the mantrapushpa lands and to give him the Rajpal produce for 1921-22 of his Mantrapushpa lands. The appeal is rejected.

Memo No. 2257 Mis — Dated, Bangalore, the 28th April 1930

Copy of the above 283-28.10 is forwarded with compliments to the Huzrai Commissioner in Mysore for information with records received with his letter No. C.1383 of 1928-29 dated 5th March 1930.

By order,

for Secretary to Government,

Financial Department.

GS 28/4